DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 011 SP 020 198

AUTHOR Hockman, Elaine M.
TITLE The Effects of Change in Governance Structure on the Practices and Outcomes of an Experienced Teachers' Center. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Wayne State Univ., Detroit, MI. Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Change; *Administrative Organization; Elementary Secondary Education; *Governing Boards; Inservice Teacher Education; *Organizational Effectiveness; Policy Formation; Power Structure; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Board functions, participation, activities, and program outcomes of the Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development were studied to determine the effects of a change in board membership on the functioning of the center. From 1975 to September 1979, the center's governing board had been composed of key officials, several whom were teachers, of five educational organizations. In October 1979, membership was expanded to include six more teachers in response to federal and state teacher center legislation requiring a teacher majority on such boards. Trend analyses were conducted over a five-year period through examination of documents from board meetings and objective measures of program planning and outcomes for three center components: (1) Field Consultant Service; (2) the Mathematics Education Resource Center; and (3) the Reading Resource Center. Characteristics of the five-member governing board during the first four years differed from those of the 11-member policy board in the fifth year. Fewer board meetings were held, and agendas were less complex in the fifth year. Financial issues remained a major concern for board consideration, although obtaining release time for teachers became a recurring issue in the fifth year. For all five years, teachers were the major participants in motion formulation, and there was very little controversy among board members on the issues. Program decisions continued to be made by the staff of the center, as the board remained primarily concerned with funding aspects of the center's activities. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217011

THE EFFECTS OF CHANGE IN GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE ON THE PRACTICES AND OUTCOMES OF AN EXPERIENCED TEACHERS' CENTER

Final Report

Prepared by

Elaine M. Hockman,
Evaluation Specialist
The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development
469 College of Education
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202
(313) 577-1684

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Elaine M. Hockman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This product has been produced with support from a subcontract which was federally funded by the Department of Education, National Institute of Education. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the National Institute of Education, or the Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

SP 020 198

Introduction

The issue of governance has been and continues to be a major concern in the teachers' center movement. Membership and representation on policy boards have commanded much attention in the teachers' center literature. There is ample agreement among these authors that teachers should be actively involved in the governance of their centers. Teacher involvement is emphasized by the requirement of a collaborative policy board consisting of a majority of teachers with the remaining seats filled by administrators and other interested personnel. This membership requirement is embodied in both the federal teacher center legislation and the professional growth legislation of the state of Michigan (U.S. Office of Education, 1978; State of Michigan, 1979).[1]

When The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development was established, the legislation requiring a majority of teachers on the board was not yet enacted. The Detroit Center was formed with the cooperation of five major educational organizations. These were the Detroit Federation of Teachers (DFT), the Detroit Public Schools (DPS), the Organization of School Administrators and Supervisors (OSAS), Wayne County Intermediate School District (WCISD), and the College of Education, Wayne State University (WSU). Top level personnel from each of these organizations made up the original five-member governance board.

The five-member governance board of key officials from the five organizations served The Detroit Center from December, 1975 to September, 1979. In October, 1979, the governing body of The Center changed to conform to the professional growth legislation requirements. Membership was expanded to include six teachers. The president of the DFT and her representative during the first four years of governance board membership were included among these six teachers in the fifth year of Center governance. To bring the Board to a total of eleven members, necessary to have a majority of teachers, two members from DPS were included.

The change in governance structure at the start of the fifth year of The Detroit Center's history allowed us to engage in a quasi-experiment of both local and national importance. As pointed out by Yarger (1979), the focus of many collaborative structures has been on the process of collaboration with little or no attention paid to the relationship of the collaborative activity to the programs that emerge. The purpose of this research was to study the effect of a major change in a teacher center governance structure upon its programs, participation, and outcomes. The research followed a time series design where the change in governance structure served as the introduction of the "experimental treatment." The research was concerned with the effects of the change in governance upon the functioning of The Center, namely the programs sponsored or facilitated by three Center Components: Field Consultant Service (FCS), the Mathematics Education Resource Center (MERC), and the Reading Resource Center (RRC).

---

[1]Appendix A presents a chronological reporting of the official Michigan stand on governance of professional growth centers. Appendix B presents documentation of the duties of The Detroit Center governance/policy Board.

The FCS provides a variety of staff development programs and resources upon request from personnel in the Detroit School system.

The MERC provides mathematics inservice activities, a collection of circulating resources for use in teaching mathematics, and support to the rest of The Center in the area of mathematics.

The RRC provides reading inservice activities, a collection of circulating resources for use in teaching reading, and support to the rest of The Center in the area of reading.

Purpose

The research was designed to answer four questions:

1. Does a change in governance structure result in a change in the function of the board?
2. What characterizes activities, participation, and outcomes of The Center during its first year of operation when governed by a board consisting of key educational personnel?
3. What changes occur in activities, participation, and outcomes as The Center continues operations under the original board?
4. What changes occur in activities, participation, and outcomes after the governing board has changed its membership to include a majority of teachers?

Design of the Study

The research design was essentially a time series quasi-experiment as described by Campbell and Stanley (1963). The independent variable was "time," which can be equated with increasing experience. Between the periods of July to September, 1979 and October to December, 1979 the introduction of the "experimental treatment" occurred. This experimental treatment was the change in the composition of the governance Board.

In order to answer the four questions posed above, it was necessary to measure objectively aspects of Board functioning and program characteristics. The data necessary to construct these measures have been recorded in a consistant manner ever since The Center opened its doors.

Objective Measures of Governance Board Functioning

Three documents were available for each Board meeting. These meeting documents were the agenda, a list of handouts, and the minutes. Eight measures of Board functioning were derived from these three documents. Theses measures were:

1. The number of major items on the agenda. A major item was identified by a Roman numeral on the agenda. Thus the number of major items per agenda was equivalent to the number of Roman numerals on the agenda.

2. The total number of topics included in the agenda.
3. An index of agenda complexity was derived by dividing the total number of topics by the number of major items. When this agenda complexity index is equal to one, the number of different topics is equal to the number of major items. A large index indicates that the major topics were broken down into many distinct items.
4. The number of handouts for the meeting
5. The number of people attending the meeting that were recorded in the minutes.
6. The number of formal motions made at the meeting that were recorded in the minutes
7. The number of pages in the minutes
8. The number of typed lines in the minutes

Objective Measures of Program Planning, Process, and Outcomes

The three Center components have kept extensive records on their services ever since The Center opened in March, 1976. The content of these records can be divided into three categories: planning, process, and outcome. (The complete list of program variables and how they were coded for the research is presented in Appendix C. A summary of these program variables is presented below.) Planning information includes those records that reflect decisions about the form the activity will take. These measures include:

1. The number of persons who attended the activity
2. The total participant hours clocked in the activity
3. The education positions held by the participants such as teachers, administrators, or paraprofessionals
4. The schools represented by the participants such as elementary, middle, or high school or schools from a district other than Detroit
5. Participant ratings of characteristics of the activity. These include:

    a. Your overall evaluation of this activity
    b. The activity leader's presentation of the subject
    c. The activity leader's knowledge of the subject
    d. The materials used in this activity
    e. The information, knowledge or concepts you learned
    f. The skills or techniques you gained

Outcome information is also provided by the participants. The participants rate the usefulness of the activity as well as the potential for sharing the information gained:

    g. The potential for using what you have learned in your work
    h. The potential for sharing what you have learned with colleagues

In addition, the participants indicate the ways in which they will be able to use the information gained from the activity. The check list includes:

1. Use new methods
2. Use new materials
3. Use new content
4. To motivate learning
5. To improve instruction
6. To improve organization and planning
7. To create a more positive education environment.

Time Line

The Center's operation has been divided into quarter years. The time line giving quarter numbers is presented in Table 1. All governance and program data have been tabled in a format similar to that presented in Table 1. The Center officially began operation in March, 1976, but the Board met before this date. Meetings held by the Board prior to the opening of The Center are referenced as "quarter 0."

Analysis Procedures

Each Board meeting and each Center activity were given a unique identification code that included the quarter and its chronological sequence among meetings or activities. FCS, MERC, and RRC activities were coded separately as three distinct populations. Each of these components can be thought of as a separate teachers' center that works collaboratively with the other centers. Each of these components has its own director who is responsible for that component.

All activity and meeting variables were coded in a fashion compatible with a statistical package, Michigan Interactive Data Analysis Sytem (MIDAS). Aside from quarterly and yearly descriptive statistics on each variable, trend analyses were accomplished through linear regression, polynominal regression, analysis of variance, profile analysis, and discriminant analysis.

TABLE 1

Time Line for the Period Covered by the Research

DATE	FALL	WINTER	SPRING	SUMMER
	October - December	January - March	April - June	July - September
YEAR 1: 1976	0	0	1	2
YEAR 2: 1976-77	3	4	5	6
YEAR 3: 1977-78	7	8	9	10
YEAR 4: 1978-79	11	12	13	14
YEAR 5: 1979-80	15	16	17	18

Were There Changes in Board Functioning?

A change in name accompanied the change in Board composition. The original board was called the "Governance Board;" the new Board is called the "Policy Board." In each case, it is interesting to note that a noun has been used to describe the type of board that is in power. A noun does not describe how a thing functions. A "Governance Board" implies a group who exercise authority or control. A "Policy Board" implies a group that adopts a definite action for the sake of expediency or facility. "Governance" implies more power than does "Policy." "Policy" implies a closer tie with institutional activity than does "Governance." A "Governance" Board would have power to appoint representatives to set policy if that Board were not prepared to determine policy first-hand.

Berne (1963) formulated a theory of structure and dynamics of organizations and groups. According to this formulation, an eleven-member board that represents five groups should be less efficient than a five-member board that represents the same five groups. Berne hypotesizes that when there are as many roles in the organizational structure as there are slots in the "manning table," the manning ratio is 1 and the group is a completely organized group. For the Board at hand, there are five roles:

1) Representing DFT
2) Representing DPS
3) Representing OSAS
4) Representing WCISD
5) Representing WSU

The structure of the original Governance Board had one person per role, or five slots-five roles. The structure of the new Policy Board has eleven slots (members) but the same five roles. Thus the manning ratio for the original Governance Board is 5/5 or 1.0 — a completely organized group — while the manning ratio for the Policy Board is 5/11 or .45, an overmanned group.

Several meeting attendance statistics can be computed that may be considered as indicators of meeting efficiency. If an "overmanned" group were a portent of inefficiency, it would be expected that the values of the attendance statistics would be the least favorable in the fifth year, which is the "overmanned" year.

The first indicator of efficiency is the number of board meetings that were held, taken as a percentage of the expected number of meetings for that year. These percentages are presented in Table 2.

In the first two years, more board meetings were held than the expected one meeting a month. In the third year at the July meeting, the board decided that an August meeting was not necessary; therefore, an August meeting was not scheduled. In the fifth year, however, three scheduled meetings were cancelled. One meeting was rescheduled to become the first meeting of the sixth year.

A second index of potential meeting efficiency is the percentage of meetings attended by the original board members. These percentages are presented in Table 3. The fifth year marked the highest attendance by the original DFT member and the lowest attendance rates for the other four original members.

TABLE 2

Number of Center Board Meetings Held Each Year,
As a Percentage of the Expected Number of Meetings

Year	Number of Meetings Expected	Number of Meetings Held	%
1	10	11	110%
2	12	14	117
3	12	11	92
4	12	12	100
5	12	9	75

TABLE 3

Percentage of Center Board Meetings Attended
by the Original Members from Each Organization

Organization	Percentage of Meetings Attended				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
DFT	45%	64%	64%	42%	89%
DPS	27	36	36	25	11
OSAS[a]	82	57	91	83	44
WCISD	36	0	0	0	0
WSU	64	64	64	33	33

[a]Includes both the original member and his replacement after retirement.

DFT: Detroit Federation of Teachers

DPS: Detroit Public Schools

OSAS: Organization of School Administrators and Supervisors

WCISD: Wayne County Intermediate School District

WSU: Wayne State University, College of Education

A third index of potential meeting efficiency is the percentage of meetings attended by the expected number of members or their representatives. These percentages are presented in Table 4. Year five marks the lowest expected attenance rates for DFT, WSU, and DPS. In years 1-4, each meeting should be attended by one member per orgaization. In year 5, there should be 6 from DFT, 2 from DPS, and 1 from each of the other organizations.

TABLE 4

Percentage of Center Board Meetings Attended
by the Expected Number of Members or Their Representatives

Organization	Percentage of Meetings Attended				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
DFT	100%	100%	100%	92%	56%
DPS	82	57	100	67	44
OSAS[a]	82	86	82	83	89
WCISD	82	93	100	100	100
WSU	100	100	100	92	56

[a] Includes both the original member and his replacement after retirement.

The facilitation of teacher attendance at Board meetings became a topic of discussion in year five. a topic that was never necessary in previous years. From the above statistics, it is apparent that the "over-manned" Policy Board did encounter scheduling and attendance problems that had not been previously encountered. Meeting times that were most compatible with teacher schedules were least compatible with the WSU calendar.

In their report on documenting Teacher Centers, Yarger and Mertens (1979, p. 26) state that an attempt was made to obtain information regarding the involvement of the various Policy Board role groups in decision-making. These Policy Boards all fit the federal model of at least 50% teachers. The authors, however, found this information to be inaccessible. The participating projects felt that this information would be dysfunctional, perhaps harmful. A problem was also found in collecting Policy Board meeting attendance data. It seemed impossible to get exact attendance by role group. For further documentation, the authors decided to eliminate the questions on role group participation in decision-making but would continue to attempt gathering role group attendance data.

The analysis of the Governance/Policy Board minutes afforded role group information on both attendance and formal decision-making in, e.g., motions. Data were available for 57 meetings over a 5-year period. Exact attendance data were available for 56 of these 57 meetings. The Board expressed no negative feelings about allowing these data to be used in this research project. In contrast to the experience of Yarger and Mertens, The Detroit Center Board felt that the kinds of information available from their meetings would serve an important need among teacher centers: understanding how an experienced policy board can operate effectively.

Analysis of Policy Making: Formal Motions

The number of formal motions made at each Board meeting was recorded. These motions encompass decisions regarding personnel, salary, budget, funding, approval of reports, and actions that the Board itself should take such as specific lobbying efforts. Excluded from these counts were motions to approve minutes and motions for adjournment. The average number of motions made at Board meeting each quarter and each year are presented in Table 5.

The mean numbers of motions made per meeting differ from year to year. In the first half-year of Board meetings, an average of 1.9 motions was made per meeting. No formal motions were made during the next four quarters. All decisions were recorded as, for example, "the Board agreed," "by common consent," and "it was agreed." The increase in number of motions per meeting that occurred in the summer of 1977 and continued during the third year (1977-78) was a result of a definite policy decision.

The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Management and Budget conducted a successful audit of The Center. The necessity of careful documentation of all official decisions, as well as Center program record-keeping, was underscored by this audit experience. Readily available documentation assists the process of audit. At the August 11, 1977 meeting the Director made the following report:

> ... is reviewing every 1975-76 expenditure, collecting documentation supporting the approval of expenditures, and trying to reconsile budget print-outs with actual Center expenditures. She (the Director) stressed the necessity for formal motions in the minutes on major decisions made during Conference Calls must be supported by official action at Board meetings.

Minutes of subsequent meetings reflect the adherence to this policy of formalizing Board decisions.

TABLE 5

Average Number of Formal Motions Made at Meetings in Each Quarter

GB/PB	FALL	WINTER	SPRING	SUMMER	YEAR TOTAL	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	S.D.
YEAR 1: 1976	—	1.3	2.2	.0	1.2	1.17
YEAR 2: 1976-77	.0	.0	.0	2.0	.6	1.40
YEAR 3: 1977-78	2.7	3.0	3.3	6.0	3.5	2.30
YEAR 4: 1978-79	3.3	1.7	1.7	2.7	2.3	1.23
YEAR 5: 1979-80	3.0	2.5	1.7	3.0	2.4	1.52

In addition to recording the number of motions per meeting, the person making the motion as well as the person seconding the motion was recorded. All motions were passed. The formal motion, then, became the final step in the discussion of an issue. The motion was not formulated until the Board had made clear what the issue, possible courses of action, and agreed upon action were.

Table 6 presents for each year the proportion of motions made by members or representatives from each of the five governance institutions. The proportion of motions seconded by members or representatives from each institution are also recorded on Table 6. The teacher members or representatives made more motions than any other organization members. In the fifth year when teacher membership was increased, the teachers also were more active in seconding the motions. These statistics show that the teacher members of the Board have played an active and dominant role in the formal aspect of decision-making about Center business.

TABLE 6

Proportions of Motions Made and Seconded
by Members or Representatives of Each Governance Organization

YEAR	DFT	DPS	OSAS	WCISD	WSU
			MADE MOTION		
1	.538	.077	.154	.077	.154
2	.500	.250	.125	.000	.125
3	.375	.150	.150	.075	.250
4	.481	.000	.185	.222	.111
5	.696	.043	.174	.000	.043
			SECONDED MOTION		
1	.154	.231	.231	.231	.154
2	.125	.250	.375	.125	.125
3	.200	.100	.150	.250	.300
4	.111	.111	.074	.481	.222
5	.565	.000	.043	.130	.217

A simple model was used to analyze the formal motions with respect to the initiation of the issue and who would be affected by the content of the motion. The person(s) or agency who initiated the issue and the person(s) or agency to which the issue was addressed were tabled in a "transition" matrix, which is reproduced here as Table 7. The rows of this matrix represent the source of the issue, and the columns represent the group that will be affected by the decision. The proportion in each cell represents the probability of an issue initiated by the "source" group affecting the "destination" group.

Each year the majority of the issues are generated by the Director or the staff of The Center. The "other" category includes the State Department of Education as well as member organizations of the Board. The "other" category is the least frequent category. The destination group called "none" represents those decisions that are complete in themselves and require no further action on the part of any one, such as accepting, receiving, or approving reports that describe past Center business.

The majority of motions ultimately affect staff. These include, for example, personnel decisions and budget decisions. Decisions initiated by the Board that affect the Board include, for example, decisions to involve the Board in lobbying efforts and the acceptance of Policy Board by-laws.

These "source $\longrightarrow$ destination" tabulations of issues that resulted in formal motions present only two links in the chain representing the total history of an issue. The scope of the present research precludes a thorough investigation of the history and future of an issue. This line of research would be interesting to pursue.

The analysis of formal motions made by the Board shows no change with change in Board membership.

Meeting Format

Agendas were established and distributed prior to the meeting. The agendas were consistently presented in outline form. The complexity of the agenda structure steadily decreased over the five-year period. Agendas from the earliest years were lengthy and provided a narrative that detailed the status of the business of the meeting. Agendas from the fifth year were much shorter. The narative for the major topics was replaced by phrases. The number of handouts per meeting varied randomly, not following a time trend. The minutes from year three were characterized by more formal motions, more lines, and more pages. The detail in the minutes from year three reflect the attempt to provide thorough documentation of all Center business.

TABLE 7

Transition Probabilities for Each "Source ——→ Destination" Pattern of Formal Board Motions

Year	Source	Destination				Proportion of Motion Issues From Each Source
		Staff	Board	Other	None	
1	Dir./Staff	.875	.000	.000	.125	.615
	Board	.200	.600	.200	.000	.385
	Other	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
2	Dir./Staff	.833	.000	.000	.167	.750
	Board	1.000	.000	.000	.000	.250
	Other	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
3	Dir./Staff	.714	.000	.000	.286	.718
	Board	.444	.111	.333	.111	.231
	Other	.500	.500	.000	.000	.051
4	Dir./Staff	.550	.000	.100	.350	.741
	Board	.000	.750	.250	.000	.148
	Other	1.000	.000	.000	.000	.111
5	Dir./Staff	.667	.000	.133	.200	.682
	Board	.000	.500	.500	.000	.273
	Other	.000	1.000	.000	.000	.045

Issues Discussed at Board Meetings

The minutes from each Board meeting were read, and discussion relevant to each emerging issue was clipped and filed under that topic. The proportion of each set of minutes devoted to each topic was computed as well as the proportion of all minutes from a quarter year period. These issues are presented in Table 8 along with a summary index of the relative frequency of each topic per year. This index is simply the sum of the quarterly proportions for the year. The average quarterly proportion can be obtained by dividing the reported sums by four.

Some issues were always dominant. These include budget matters (the allocation of funds), funding (obtaining funds from the State), lobbying with legislators for continued funding, federal funding, and State legislation regarding professional growth centers.

Some issues required attention on a regular basis but did not require a large amount of discussion in the minutes. These include receiving quarterly budget reports and Center reports.

Some issues were only periodically part of the discussion. Career Education programs took up considerable Board time the two years that State Career Education funds were directed through The Center. A National Science Foundation program that was to be directed by the former head of MERC was an issue for a short period when the details of Center involvement were worked out.

In the period before the change in Board structure occurred, considerable time was devoted to governance structure in general and The Center's Board in particular.

Center program information was consistently part of meeting discussion. In addition, specifics about Center program were included in Board handouts rather than in the minutes themselves.

The decline in the topic of "relationship to DPS" and the emergence of the topic of "relationship to WSU" are direct outcomes of the change in fiscal agent from WSU in years 1-3 to DPS in years 4 and 5. This change, necessitated by legislation, introduced new issues to the Board such as continuation of The Center site at WSU and the procedures for consultant payment.

The work of FCS, MERC, and RRC, however, was only very rarely discussed at Board meetings. Special Project Schools, on the other hand, were a constant source of discussion. (The Special Project Schools (SPS) component provides building-level inservice planning, resources, and activities to four designated schools.)

The charge to FCS was recorded, however, in the very first Board meeting, December 18, 1975:

> The Governance Board reaffirmed the position that this component (FCS) must receive top priority. As the outreach component, the acceptance and success of The Center will rest on its effectiveness in meeting the needs of teachers and staffs, individually or in groups. Staffs must know that requests for Field Consultant Services are to be vol-

untary; they must have the freedom to cooperate. How, ever, there may be instances when entire faculties are requested to participate in an inservice activity.

MERC and RRC were always perceived as support systems. Special activities sponsored by these components were announced either on agendas or handouts. Flyers advertising MERC and RRC activities were always made available to Board members. One major reason why MERC and RRC did not receive much attention at Board meetings is the fact that each of these components has its own advisory committee that is very much concerned with the programs of these components. In addition, Board meetings were held in either MERC or RRC, which led to considerable informal discussion with staff regarding these lab programs and services both prior to and after meetings.

Board Reflections on Year Five Issues

A questionnaire was distriubted to the Policy Board at their January, 1981 meeting. The questionnaire included three tasks that required written responses from the members. The tasks were:

1. Please describe what you consider to be the most important Center policy issues discussed by the Board from October, 1979 to September, 1980.

2. Which Center programs would you describe to someone who is curious about what The Center does?

3. How do you define "policy?" How do you distinguish between the Board's role in setting policy and establishing program?

Four of the eleven members completed the questionnaire, two original representatives, one new teacher member, and a new representative for one of the organizations. These four respondents were in complete agreement that budget cuts and the maintainance of quality Center services were the two major issues of concern.

TABLE 8

Issues Discussed at Board Meetings and
an Index of Amount of Minutes Devoted to That Issue

ISSUE	Sums of Quarterly Relative Frequencies				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Special Project Schools	.000	.504	.464	.123	.174
Budget matters: allocation of funds	.379	.137	.157	.186	.671
Funding: obtaining funds from State	.086	.413	.096	.444	.209
Lobbying for funds	.069	.255	.109	.312	.258
Career Education (mandated program)	.000	.098	.364	.404	.000
Federal funding	.000	.152	.168	.091	.359
Michigan legislation for prof. gr. centr.	.000	.207	.334	.048	.041
Center personnel	.021	.044	.109	.188	.285
Governance Board structure	.000	.208	.125	.217	.000
Center program issues	.053	.220	.032	.140	.148
Relationship with WSU	.000	.000	.191	.071	.132
Evaluation of The Center	.168	.242	.045	.095	.000
General educational issues	.023	.017	.000	.116	.132
Quarterly budget reports	.000	.055	.197	.050	.040
The study of governance board	.000	.000	.111	.068	.132
Center reports	.030	.078	.087	.075	.050
Other centers and programs	.000	.202	.000	.000	.088
Relationship with DPS	.087	.154	.032	.103	.000
Board's resolution re Mich. Legislation	.000	.000	.276	.000	.000
Dissemination of info about Center	.055	.044	.096	.052	.044
Board committees	.000	.044	.059	.090	.034
NSF Program (collaborative program)	.000	.000	.222	.000	.000
Application to State Dept. 79-80/80-81 yrs.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.221
Conference attendance	.032	.077	.013	.085	.040
Other funding sources	.000	.091	.012	.053	.040
Incentive for Center participation	.131	.141	.000	.010	.000
Procedures for paying consultants	.034	.000	.000	.163	.000
Center salaries	.074	.148	.015	.000	.000
Center operation/management	.000	.000	.000	.093	.044
Governance Operation	.074	.000	.000	.000	.093
Relationship with State Dept. of Educa.	.181	.037	.000	.020	.059
State Bd. of Ed hearing on prof. gr. centrs.	.000	.000	.059	.000	.000
FCS, MERC, and RRC	.021	.017	.000	.000	.000
Travel policy	.176	.000	.000	.120	.000
Needs assessment	.006	.000	.000	.000	.000

What Characterizes Center Planning, Participation, and Outcomes?

The Link Between the Board and The Center Components

Formal interaction between the staff of FCS, MERC, and RRC was at a minimum. FCS, MERC, and RRC staff members rarely attended Board meetings. The three component directors attended the first Board meeting to be held at The Center, which was the first meeting in the second quarter. Previous meetings were held at the offices of the member organizations. Once the meetings began to be held at The Center on a regular basis, informal contact between Board and Center staff increased. The meetings were held in either MERC or RRC labs. The respective staff members often remained working in their labs during the course of the meetings. Center staff members occasionally made reports at Board meetings. The head of FCS substituted for the Director and Assistant Director at a summer meeting in 1979.

The formal line of communication between staff and the Board was through the Director. At Board meetings the Director would give a report in which staff concerns were expressed. Likewise, at weekly staff meetings, the Director would report Board discussion and decisions to the staff. Board members were also always kept advised of Center program through Center flyers and announcements.

Board members and their representatives have served The Center in ways other than policy making. Two Board members and two representatives have served as consultants for Center activities. Two of these consultants are teachers, one is a representative from CSAS, and one is a representative from WCISD. Three activities were conducted prior to service on the Board; two activities were conducted during service on the Board. In addition, one of the teacher members has served on the Reading Advisory Committee, helped organize the reading lab materials, and provided one-on-one consultations. Board members and their representatives have also participated in Center activities.

From the analysis of Board meeting minutes, it was clearly evident that Board decisions were directed at policy issues and not specific areas of program planning. From information in early State documents (see Appendix A), it would seem that the governance body of a professional growth center would be involved in "planning, coordinating, and providing for the implementation of professional development programs." The later State language described the policy board as "a body which sets policy," thus removing the Board from program planning. Center documents in which the activities of the Board are described (see Appendix B) also indicate that it is staff and not the Board that has always established Center program.

The Policy Board members who responded to the January, 1981 questionnaire reiterated that it is staff and not Board that establishes program. Some of the comments include:

- The Policy Board gives staff members the overall direction. Staff is often helpful in suggesting or recommending policy... but it is the Board's responsibility to decide upon which are the most functional in terms of assuring the accomplishment of the organization's mission and goals.

- The Board gives staff members clear approval to use their own expertise in delivering the programs.

- It is the responsibility of The Center staff to establish programs under the supervision and approval of the Director.

Given the above context, then, direct Board influences upon program are not to be expected. Indirect influence, however, would be expected, especially regarding the effect of declining funding. Budget decisions are the business of the Board; how to turn that money into service is the business of the staff.

Analysis of Activity Charactertistics Over Time

Quarterly distributions were obtained for all variables used to describe the activities of FCS, MERC, and RRC. The complete tabulations of these data are available upon request. Summaries of some of these results from the last three years are presented in Tables 9 —— 11, which include means, variances, and results of the regression analyses, in the form of coefficients of determination. Curvilinear relationship was more characteristic of the data than was linear. This is shown by the larger coefficients of determination for the polynomial regressions than for the linear regressions.[2] Analysis of variance of yearly means and seasonal means also shows very few straight-line progressions. Significant curvilinear regressions were found more often among the planning variables, such as number of hours per activity, and number of sessions per activity. In the early years, activities during the school year tended to be longer than in the later years. Summer activities have always tended to have more sessions and hours than school year activities. However, fewer activities are conducted in the summer. Changes in planning variables reflect budget cuts in a more direct manner than do changes in participation and outcome characteristics. A decline in funding rate for The Center was not a decision of the Policy Board; it was a decision at the state level. Board level decisions had to reflect the best use of the available money.

The effect of budget considerations is evident in the number of activities logged for each component. FCS receives the greater budget proportion; 587 workshop activities were logged for FCS. MERC and RRC receive considerably less budget, with slightly more going to MERC for the computer hardware. There were 182 MERC and 157 RRC workshop activities logged in the five-year period.

Aside from change in amount of service that could be delivered, another change in the fifth year was the increase in the use of Center staff as consultants. This again reflects a declining budget and the inability to pay a large number of outside consultants.

Despite changes in planning variables, no real change occurred in the participant evaluations of the conduct and the usefulness of the activities. The activities that were provided retained the established Center quality. The participant evaluation means presented in Tables 9 through 11 are presented in standard score form, with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10.

---

[2]Quarter, not year, was used as the time variable in the regression analysis.

TABLE 9

Means, Variances, and Time Series Summary for
Program, Participation, and Outcome Characteristics for a Three-Year Period

FIELD CONSULTANT SERVICES

ACTIVITY CHARACTERISTIC	MEANS			VARIANCES			COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION	
	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	Linear	Polynomial
PLANNING								
Number of Days	7.0 >[a]	3.4	5.0	175 >[a] >[b]	73 <[f]	125	.00	.07
Number of Consultants	1.2	1.3	1.2	.36 <[d]	.67 >[e]	.31	.00	.04*
Number of Sessions	1.9 >[a]	1.3	1.7	1.76 >[a] <[c]	.78 <[f]	2.61	.00	.05*
Number of Hours/Per Sess.	3.54 >[a] >[b]	3.1	3.2	2.07	2.07	1.89	.01	.06*
PARTICIPATION								
Number of Participants	28.0	28.4	29.4	585.61 >[a] <[c]	283.22 <[f]	805.05	.00	.00
Total Participant Hours	146.9 >[a] >[b]	105.4	111.7	212 25 >[a] >[b]	7697 <[f]	12069	.02*	.07*
Questionnaire Return Rate	.77	.80	.79	.04 >[b]	.05 >[e]	.03	.00	.03

[a] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 4

[b] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 5

[c] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 5

[d] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 4

[e] Year 4 is significantly greater than Year 5

[f] Year 4 is significantly less than Year 5

*Significant at the ,05 level

TABLE 9 - continued

Means, Variances, and Time Series Summary for
Program, Participation, and Outcome Characteristics for a Three-Year Period

FIELD CONSULTANT SERVICES

ACTIVITY CHARACTERISTIC	MEANS			VARIANCES			COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION	
	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	Linear	Polynomial
PROCESS: EVALUATION OF ACTIVITY								
Your overall evaluation of this activity	48.8	50.6	50.9	106.65	97.29	93.33	.01	.03
Activity leader's presentation of the subject	48.7	51.5	50.5	109.62 >[a]	77.22	102.14	.01	.03
Activity leader's knowledge of the subject	49.3	51.2	50.0	100.37	102.16	98.41	.00	.02
Materials used in this activity	48.3 <[c]	50.2	51.9	108.56	105.37	80.84	.04*	.06*
Information, knowledge or concepts you learned	49.2	50.3	50.8	103.38	104.12	93.64	.01	.04*
Skills or techniques you gained	48.6 <[c]	50.6	51.3	108.63	98.73	88.38	.01	.04*

[a] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 4

[b] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 5

[c] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 5

[d] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 4

[e] Year 4 is significantly greater than Year 5

[f] Year 4 is significantly less than Year 5

* Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 9 - continued

Means, Variances, and Time Series Summary for
Program, Participation, and Outcome Characteristics for a Three-Year Period

FIELD CONSULTANT SERVICES

ACTIVITY CHARACTERISTIC	MEANS			VARIANCES			COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION	
	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	Linear	Polynomial
OUTCOMES								
Potential for using what you have learned in your work	48.8	50.6	51.0	108.69	103.23	86.45	.01	.05*
Potential for sharing what you have learned with your colleagues	49.4	49.7	50.9	99.85	109.75	94.22	.00	.06*
Use new methods	49.0	50.3	51.0	127.79 >[a] >[b]	78.31	81.43	.00	.02
Use new materials	49.5	49.1	51.2	102.99	102.88	94.14	.00	.02
Use new content	50.0	49.5	50.4	105.12	99.16	96.29	.00	.04*
To motivate learning	48.6 <[c]	50.7	51.2	117.14 >[b]	106.02 >[e]	73.68	.00	.01
To improve instruction	49.8	49.0	50.9	115.16	92.82	87.87	.00	.03
To improve organization and planning	50.4	49.1	50.2	96.89	103.19	102.71	.00	.07*
To create a more positive education enviornment	49.6	50.3	50.3	116.49 >[b]	97.71	83.70	.00	.02

[a] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 4

[b] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 5

[c] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 5

[d] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 4

[e] Year 4 is significantly greater than Year 5

[f] Year 4 is significantly less than Year 5

* Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 10

Means, Variances, and Time Series Summary for
Program, Participation, and Outcome Characteristics for a Three-Year Period

MATHEMATICS EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTER

ACTIVITY CHARACTERISTIC	MEANS			VARIANCES			COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION	
	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	Linear	Polynomial
PLANNING								
Number of Days	13.4	9.3	8.1	189.27 >b	186.69 >e	83.42	.03	.05
Number of Consultants	1.4	1.4	1.4	.25 <c	<d .81	1.03	.03	.14*
Number of Sessions	3.06 >a >b	2.3	2.2	2.72	2.11	1.60	.01	.04
Number of Hours/Per Sess.	2.30	2.30	2.07	.724 >b	.828 >e	.275	.00	.02
PARTICIPATION								
Number of Participants	16.1 <d	24.6	19.1	90.05 <d	355.23 >e	87.96	.00	.07
Total Participant Hours	98.9	97.5	73.9	6276 >b	<d 14846 >e	3091	.00	.01
Questionnaire Return Rate	.67	.65	.72	.09	.09	.08	.00	.06

[a] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 4

[b] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 5

[c] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 5

[d] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 4

[e] Year 4 is significantly greater than Year 5

[f] Year 4 is significantly less than Year 5

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 10 - continued

Means, Variances, and Time Series Summary for
Program, Participation, and Outcome Characteristics for a Three-Year Period

MATHEMATICS EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTER

ACTIVITY CHARACTERISTIC	MEANS			VARIANCES			COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION	
	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	Linear	Polynomial
PROCESS: EVALUATION OF ACTIVITY								
Your overall evaluation of this activity	52.4	47.9	51.1	71.09 <[d]	129.14 >[e]	70.92	.00	.03
Activity leader's presentation of the subject	51.0	48.1	52.3	71.47 <[d]	138.52 >[e]	55.44	.01	.03
Activity leader's knowledge of the subject	51.0	48.2	52.1	81.82	137.73 >[e]	47.66	.02	.05
Materials used in this activity	52.2	48.1	50.9	82.08	113.97	88.81	.00	.03
Information, knowledge or concepts you learned	52.3	48.2	50.8	70.47	117.99	94.04	.00	.03
Skills or techniques you gained	50.5	48.5	52.2	103.23	110.68	74.99	.00	.03

[a] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 4

[b] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 5

[c] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 5

[d] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 4

[e] Year 4 is significantly greater than Year 5

[f] Year 4 is significantly less than Year 5

* Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 10 - continued

Means, Variances, and Time Series Summary for
Program, Participation, and Outcome Characteristics for a Three-Year Period

MATHEMATICS EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTER

ACTIVITY CHARACTERISTIC	MEANS			VARIANCES			COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION	
	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	Linear	Polynomial
OUTCOMES								
Potential for using what you have learned in your work	50.9	48.5	51.7	113.9 >b	122.38 >e	44.07	.00	.03
Potential for sharing what you have learned with your colleagues	51.9	48.6	50.4	126.76	98.20	74.25	.01	.03
Use new methods	53.0	49.3	48.1	94.17	91.45	114.37	.00	.02
Use new materials	52.2	48.3	50.6	105.57	104.69	81.92	.00	.03
Use new content	50.3	48.8	51.8	114.65	108.00	71.22	.02	.06
To motivate learning	49.7	49.6	51.0	156.61 >a >b	90.81	61.40	.02	.03
To improve instruction	52.7	48.5	49.8	121.20	91.53	87.26	.01	.05
To improve organization and planning	53.9 >a	48.2	49.0	134.19 >b	96.74 >e	51.97	.04*	.13*
To create a more positive education enviornment	51.9	48.4	50.8	116.01 >b	121.69 >e	41.78	.02	.06

[a] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 4

[b] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 5

[c] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 5

[d] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 4

[e] Year 4 is significantly greater than Year 5

[f] Year 4 is significantly less than Year 5

* Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 11

Means, Variances, and Time Series Summary for
Program, Participation, and Outcome Characteristics for a Three-Year Period

READING RESOURCE CENTER

ACTIVITY CHARACTERISTIC	MEANS			VARIANCES			COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION	
	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	Linear	Polynomial
PLANNING								
Number of Days	7.8	8.4 >[e]	3.0	237.12 >[b]	175.28 >[e]	16.47	.00	.14
Number of Consultants	1.3	1.5	1.5	.30 <[d]	.75 <[c]	1.26	.13	.20
Number of Sessions	2.7 >[b]	2.4	1.8	2.60	3.35	3.50	.00	.23*
Number of Hours/Per Sess.	3.82 >[b]	3.62 >[e]	2.7	1.411 <[d]	3.562 >[e]	1.16	.16*	.37*
PARTICIPATION								
Number of Participants	22.7	31.1	25.3	107.96 <[d]	589.55 <[c]	413.07	.02	.12
Total Participant Hours	178.3 >[b]	205.6 >[e]	114.5	14599 <[d]	30692 >[e]	14475	.00	.17*
Questionnaire Return Rate	.73 <[c]	.74 <[f]	.87	.04	.06 >[e]	.03	.04	.05

[a] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 4

[b] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 5

[c] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 5

[d] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 4

[e] Year 4 is significantly greater than Year 5

[f] Year 4 is significantly less than Year 5

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 11 - continued

Means, Variances, and Time Series Summary for
Program, Participation, and Outcome Characteristics for a Three-Year Period

READING RESOURCE CENTER

ACTIVITY CHARACTERISTIC	MEANS			VARIANCES			COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION	
	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	Linear	Polynomial
PROCESS: EVALUATION OF ACTIVITY								
Your overall evaluation of this activity	49.8	48.5	51.9	64.81 <d	181.73 >e	55.30	.04	.04
Activity leader's presentation of the subject	49.7	49.3	51.2	73.69 <d	178.97 >e	51.87	.02	.03
Activity leader's knowledge of the subject	49.3	49.7	51.2	82.51 >b <d	188.72 >e	30.73	.03	.04
Materials used in this activity	49.1	48.6	52.5	83.39	155.48 >e	58.64	.03	.05
Information, knowledge or concepts you learned	48.7	48.6	53.0	72.71 <d	153.21 >e	69.54	.06	.06
Skills or techniques you gained	48.6	50.0	51.7	97.75	132.58	70.87	.04	.04

[a] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 4

[b] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 5

[c] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 5

[d] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 4

[e] Year 4 is significantly greater than Year 5

[f] Year 4 is significantly less than Year 5

* Significant the .05 level

TABLE 11 - continued

Means, Variances, and [illegible]e Series Summary for
Program, Participation, and Outcome Characteristics for a Three-Year Period

READING RESOURCE CENTER

ACTIVITY CHARACTERISTIC	MEANS			VARIANCES			COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION	
	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	Linear	Polynomial
OUTCOMES								
Potential for using what you have learned in your work	48.7	49.3	52.4	107.27	121.15	68.78	.07*	.07
Potential for sharing what you have learned with your colleagues	50.2	48.4	51.6	87.92	129.21	85.90	.02	.03
Use new methods	49.2	50.7	50.1	140.80	83.51	77.52	.01	.09
Use new materials	48.2	50.9	51.1	92.22	96.06	116.22	.01	.13
Use new content	48.9	51.8	49.4	82.71	107.83	115.55	.00	.11
To motivate learning	47.7	51.2	51.3	110.06 >b	129.37 >e	55.39	.01	.02
To improve instruction	50.3	49.2	50.6	120.44	120.74	61.12	.00	.03
To improve organization and planning	51.0	49.5	49.5	92.53	121.99	92.18	.00	.05
To create a more positive education enviornment	51.4	48.3	50.2	112.15	106.38	81.92	.00	.04

[a] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 4

[b] Year 3 is significantly greater than Year 5

[c] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 5

[d] Year 3 is significantly less than Year 4

[e] Year 4 is significantly greater than Year 5

[f] Year 4 is significantly less than Year 5

* Significant at the .05 level

The answers to questions 2 through 4 posed by this research are varied. Seasonal and annual changes in planning, participation, and outcome variables were observed. These changes reflect experience, responsiveness to current inservice needs, and necessary changes because of financial considerations. The change in Policy Board membership is not a determining factor in program changes.

As was mentioned earlier, both MERC and RRC have advisory committees that do become involved in program decisions. An excellent example is to be found in the planning characteristics describing MERC activities. The MERC advisory committee had decided that the winter program during the fourth year should be changed in such a way as to increase participation. One strategy was to respond to requests from individual schools and arrange to conduct the activities in the schools themselves. The quarterly MERC tabulations clearly show that the decisions of the advisory committee were carried out. This example is offered as evidence that the activity variables used in this study can be sensitive to specific program changes.

Where Should the Analysis of Program Characteristics Head?

The five-year data bank on program characteristics — 587 FCS activities, 182 MERC activities, and 157 RRC activities — provides a vast source of data on inservice workshop activities provided by a teachers' center.[3]

In addition to the characteristics included in this paper, information on the topic of each activity is available. The current research used only time as an independent variable for analysis purposes. No inter-relationships among variables have yet been attempted. The relationships between planning, participation, and outcome characteristics should be pursued. It would be possible, of course, to run on MIDAS all possible combinations, but good research practice certainly augers against that approach. These data can, however, be used to answer specific questions about the relationships among selected characteristics.

Some questions of interest might be:

- Is length of session related to perceived usefulness of activities?
- Are long-term activities perceived as more useful than short term activities?
- Are activities that cover similar content equally valuable when presented for the staff of one school or as an open workshop?

Here is, then, a perfect opportunity to invite collaboration with educators interested in inservice education in general and teachers' centers in particular. We would invite others to suggest specific lines of inquiry that would make use of the capabilities of this established data base. The author of this paper would be eager to discuss the use of the data base with those who are interested.

---

[3] See Appendix C.

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this research was to study the effects of a major change in the composition of a teacher center governance board on a) the functioning of that board and b) the programs sponsored by the teacher center. The study covered a five-year period from March, 1976 to September, 1980. The change in Board membership occurred in the fifth year. The change in Board membership was from a 5-member Board representing top level administration from the five member organizations to an 11-member Board whose majority consists of teachers. The paper reports in considerable detail characteristics of how both the original and new Boards functioned:

- The number of board meetings per year decreased after the change. No special meetings were held in the fifth year. One attempt was made to reschedule cancelled meetings.

- Agendas became less complex in the fifth year. Early agenda outlines often contained explanatory information; later agendas were usually just the outline.

- Minutes of meetings remained thorough over the entire five-year period. Handout material remained at a constant level.

- Funding and budget concerns remained the prime topic for Board consideration. Maintaining funding was always part of discussion. Coping with budget cuts became a problem in the later years.

- Obtaining release time for teacher members was a recurring issue in the fifth year.

- Teacher members were the major participants in motion formulation in all five years.

- There was very little controversy or disagreement among Board members on issues. No veto was ever used.

- Board decisions primarily affected budget, which in turn, affected program decisions. Program decisions, however, remained in the hands of the staff, with input from advisory committees and requests from the field.

- Even with significant changes in program planning, such as length of activity, no significant changes were evident in participation and evaluation.

The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development began its service under a 5-member board that represented top-level personnel from the five initiating organizations. The structure of this board was contrary to current thought on how teachers' centers should be governed because teachers did not constitute a majority of the board. The requirement of having a majority of teachers on a teachers' center policy board is a legislative attempt to assure teacher input into an organization that affects them. That such a Board, because of the over-representation of one group, is potentially inefficient has not been part of the considerations in the literature. The expanded Board did encounter scheduling problems for Board meetings. Scheduling problems during the early days of The Center did not exist. We can only guess what kind of effect fewer, less well-attended meetings might have had at the outset of The Center's career.

The initial Board was successful in getting The Center going. Several reasons for success must be mentioned. The Board had a common goal to begin with; the goal did not have to be sought. Staff to work towards that goal were hired, and it was that staff that developed objectives for attaining the goal of providing relevant, planned staff development activities for and with Detroit educators that are designed to increase staff competence and raise pupil achievement. The Board delegated authority for program while retaining the necessary policy making function. Input from teachers has always been considerable at the program level. Policy decisions at the Board, with or without a majority of teachers on the Board, predominantly concerned funding and budget. Without funds there would be no program. Thus Board influence on program has been indirect through their efforts at continuing Center funding. The new Board functioned in a similar manner to the old Board. The lines of communication remained the same. Quality of program remained high.

List of References

Berne, E. The Structure and Dynamics of Organizations and Groups. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1963.

Campbell, D.T. and Stanley, J.C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching. In Gage, N.L. (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963. pp. 171-246.

State of Michigan. HB-4245. Sec. 97 of the school aid act, 1979-80. Lansing, 1979.

U.S. Office of Education. Application for Grants Under Teacher Centers Program. Department of Health Education, and Welfare. Washinton, D.C., October, 1978.

Yarger, S.J. Some uncomfortable assertions about collaboration. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 1979.

Yarger, S.J. and Mertens, S.K. Documenting Teacher Centers. Report of a Field Test. Syracuse University, N.Y., August, 1979.

APPENDIX A

One line of investigation was to determine what does the governance board or policy board do. State department documents present the following information about what a professional development center governing body should do.

SOURCE: Proposed Statute Authorizing Professional Development Centers in Michigan
Page 1

DATE: August 12, 1977

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:

Sec. 2. As used in this act:

(1) "Governance council" means the body charged with establishing policy, as well as, planning, coordinating, and providing for the implementation of professional development programs for a professional development service area.

SOURCE: Proposed Statute Authorizing Professional Development Centers in Michigan
Page 5

DATE: August 12, 1977

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:

Sec. 7. A governance council shall be established by each professional development program service area according to guidelines established by the State Board of Education. Membership of the council shall be representative of teachers, school administrators, teacher education institutions, and agencies as deemed appropriate for the area; however, not less than one-half of the members shall be participating classroom teachers. A council shall have the following responsibilities:

a. Develop and adopt professional development center policies.

b. Identify the eudcational needs in cooperation with the professional development advisory council of the service area.

c. Approve all professional development center programs.

d. Establish goals and objectives for program components of the center.

e. Recommend to fiscal agent for appointment the necessary professional development center staff.

f. Develop an annual program plan.

g. Develop and approve an annual center budget.

h. Develop and approve an annual report regarding programs and expenditures.

i. Perform such other functions as are consistent with the provisions of this act.

SOURCE: Proposed Statute Authorizing Professional Development Centers in Michigan
Page 4

DATE: August 12, 1977

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:

Sec. 5 A professional development center shall employ a director, and other professional staff persons as necessary to:

a. Provide a professional development program for teachers, administrators, and other school support staff.

b. Prepare and reporduce the materials necessary for professional development programs.

c. Conduct an inventory of professional development needs.

d. Initiate programs designed for the professional development of teachers, administrators, and other school support staff of participating school districts.

e. Enter into agreement for the provision of professional development programs in accordance with guidelines established by the state board of education.

f. Obtain servides of consultants and other resource persons as appropriate.

SOURCE: State Plan for Professional Development of School Staffs
Page 6

DATE: December 7, 1977

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Policy Board

The body charged with establishing policy, planning, corodinating and providing for the implementation and evaluation of the professional development programs of a professional development center. Each such center must be operated under the supervision of such a policy board, with the majority of the policy board membership representative of all the elementary and secondary teachers to be served by the center. Such a body shall be created on the basis of one or more local or intermediate school districts.

SOURCE: State Plan for Professional Development of School Staffs
Page 16-17

DATE: December 7, 1977

V. LEGISLATIVE BASIS

The Proposed Michigan Professional Development Centers Statute

Governing Board:

A governing board is to be established for each professional development center. The board membership should be made up of teachers, school administrators, teacher education institution personnel and other agencies as deemed appropriate for the area. At least half the members of this board should be classromm teachers. The board has the following responsibilities:

1. Policies formulation.
2. Identification of professional development needs in cooperation with the professional development advisory council of the service area.
3. Approval of all center programs.
4. Establishment of goals and objectives.
5. Recommendation of staff applicants.
6. Development of an annual program structure.
7. Development of an annual report regarding programs and expenditures.

SOURCE: State Plan for Professional Development of School Staffs
Page 19

DATE: December 7, 1977

CRITERIA FOR STATE-FUNDED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTERS PROGRAMS:

d. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE. 22 points. The extent to which the proposal presents evidence of a feasible and locally acceptable governance structure for the region to be served. The proposal shall include plans for the specification of function of the governance structure, and its relationship to other educational agencies and/or organizations in the service area. Such structure should directly involve potential program participatns. No less than 50% of the members of the governing board shall be representative of classroom teachers who are participants in the center activities. Letters or resolutions from the various educational agencies and/or organizations represented in the governance structure should be submitted as evidence of agreement to the governance structure proposed.

SOURCE: A State Plan for School Staff Development In Michigan
Page 5

DATE: December 31, 1978

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Policy Board

A body which sets policy for the operation of staff development programs. Policy boards shall be composed as follows:

The majority of members shall represent the teachers in an area to be served by staff development programs. Other groups to be represented should include administrators and designated representatives of local school boards. Policy boards should be encouraged to add representation from local parent groups, other school staffs, and institutions of higher education.

The criteria for selection of members to a policy board will be determined and certification made by the constituent groups, in a manner consistent with federal guidelines.[3]

Fiscal Agent

Personnel of the staff deveopment program will be recommended by the program's policy board, . . .

---

[3]Two members of the Professional Development Advisory Group proposed a fifty-fifty division between teachers and other board members. Two other Group members preferred a position of one-third teachers, one-third administrators and other school board members, and one-third parents and other lay-persons in the area. Two members of the Group felt that the policy board must include representatives other than teachers.

SOURCE: A State Plan for School Staff Development in Michigan
Page 12

DATE: December 31, 1978

4. Role of the Office of Professional Development

Specifically the Office will:

a. Provide assistance to staff development policy boards.

SOURCE: House Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1369
Page 33, lines 13-16

DATE: April 20, 1978

13. (2) Policy for all centers once created shall be established by a

14. governing board consisting of not less than 50 percent teachers The balance

15. of the board shall be made up of representatives of school boards, administrators,

16. teacher education institutions and other agencies consdiered appropriate.

SOURCE: State Plan for School Staff Development in Michigan
Page 3

DATE: March 22, 1979

I. INTRODUCTION

Local Staff Development Centers: A local staff development center shall serve a minimum of 750 professional personnel. The purpose of the centers is to provide inservice activities to meet the identified needs of teachers, administrators and other support personnel *WHOM INDIVIDUAL CENTER POLICY BOARDS IDENTIFY AS THE TARGET GROUP* for the center activities. Local staff development centers shall identify local staff needs for inservice training, prioritize identified needs for inservice programs, identify resources for responding to needs, provide evaluation information relative to inservice programs, identify local staff development needs relative to state and federal programs with inservice components, and be represented on state staff development center policy boards.

POLICY BOARD

A BODY WHICH SETS POLICY FOR THE OPERATION OF LOCAL AND STATE STAFF DEVELOPMENT CENTER PROGRAMS. Policy Boards shall be composed as follows:

Local Center Policy Boards: A majority of the members shall be representative of teachers. The balance of the policy board shall include representatives from: local boards of education, administrators and other support personnel.

APPENDIX B

One line of investigation was to locate references in Center documents to the composition and duties of the governance/policy board. These references are presented in Appendix B.

SOURCE: The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development's first Center report.
Page 1

DATE: April 6, 1976

The first Center report, April 6, 1976, states that The Center is governed by a five member board that effectively fuses the ideas, ideals, and talents of both teachers and administrators. The five members of the board are introduced, and the board is described as:

> ... very unusual in that it is the first time, as far as is known, that representatives of a large school district, an intermediate district, a university and two unions have joined together to collectively supervise a school program. Each of the five members has veto power on any specific item. The members represent a significant collaboration between their organizations to achieve the goals of The Center.

SOURCE: The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development Manual: Program, Personnel, Policies
Page 6

DATE: June 28, 1977

CENTER GOVERNANCE

The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development has a five-member Governance Board composed of the Dean of the College of Education, Wayne State University; the Superintendent of the Detroit Public Schools; the Superintendent of Wayne County Intermediate School District; the President of the Detroit Federation of Teachers; and the President of the (Detroit) Organization of School Administrators and Supervisors. The Governance Board sets policy and has final authority for the approval of all aspects of The Center's program. Any one of the five members can beto a program if it is deemed to be ineffectual or inappropriate. A representative from the State Office of Education serves as an advisor to the Board. The multiple activities of The Center are coordinated by a director responsible to the Governance Board.

SOURCE: The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development Manual: Program, Personnel, Policies
Page 12

DATE: June 28, 1977

GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

1. The Governance Board determines all policies for The Center and has final authority for Center programs

2. The Center's Director may approve programs that do not exceed an expenditure of $10,000.00. Programs in excess of $10,000.00 must be cleared with the Governance Board.

SOURCE: The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development Manual: Program, Personnel, Policies
Page 14

DATE: June 28, 1977

CENTER TRAVEL AND CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE

I. Travel Guidelines

The Governance Board and staff of The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development believe that professional competence may be fostered by attendance at selected professional meetings. Therefore, The Center will support staff participation in conferences that relate to the goals and programs of the project.

SOURCE: The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development Manual: Program, Personnel, Policies
Page 16

DATE: June 28, 1977

GENERAL FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED

7. Governance Board members and representatives will be reimbursed for travel within the same constraints as The Center staff.

SOURCE: The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development Manual: Program, Personnel, Policies
Page 17

DATE: June 28, 1977

CENTER CONSULTANTS

2. Consultant Fees

The Governance Board approved the unitary fee of $20.00/hr. for all metropolitan area consultants. Compensation is not to exceed $100/per day. The Director has the right to use discretion and flexibility to accomodate special cases where significant preparation and travel time is involved.

SOURCE: The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development Manual: Program, Personnel, Policies
Page 5

DATE: November 1, 1979

CENTER GOVERNANCE

A representative from the State Office of Education serves as an advisor to the Board. The multiple activities of The Center are coordinated by a director responsible to the Policy Board.

SOURCE: The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development Manual: Program, Personnel, Policies
Page 5a

DATE: November 1, 1979

THE DETROIT CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY BOARD AND POLICY BOARD BY-LAWS

BOARD MEMBERSHIP

1. The Policy Board of The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development is an eleven person governing body representing the Detroit Center's five Policy Board Organiations:

   The Detroit Federation of Teachers - Six members selected by D.F.T.
   The Detroit Public Schools - Two members
   Organization of School Administrators and Supervisors - One member
   Wayne County Intermediate School District - One member
   Wayne State University-College of Education - One member

REPRESENTATIVES/DESIGNEES

1. Each Policy Board organization may designate representative(s) to attend Board meetings in lieu of Policy Board member(s).

2. A representative from the State Department of Education attends meetings and serves as a consultant/advisor to Policy Board members and staff.

DUTIES OF THE POLICY BOARD

The Detroit Center's Policy Board is responsible for:

1. Establishment of policies and goals for the operation of The Detroit Center that promote staff development activities in the Detroit School district consistent with state and local requirements and needs

2. The fiscal management of The Center, including the adoption of the annual budget, approval of quarterly budget reports, and compliance with fiscal management guidelines established by the state and the designated agency

CONTINUED:

SOURCE: The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development
Manual: Program, Personnel, Policies
Page 5a and 5b

3. Determination of comprehensive directions for programmatic planning and implementation, including the assessment of staff needs resource identification, program evlauation, and the inclusion of mandated services

4. Support and assistance in promoting the growth and effectiveness of The Detroit Center.

OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

1. Meetings

   a. Regular meetings of the Policy Board are to be held the fourth Wednesday of each month at 1:30 p.m. Special meetings may be held as necessary by consensus of the membership.

   b. Official meetings require the presence of a quorum of six composed of members or their assigned desginess. The quorum must include representatives from at least three of the five Policy Board organizations.

2. Officers

   There are no designated Board officers. Responsibility for chairing the meetings is rotated among the Policy Board membership on an alphabetical basis.

3. Record Keeping and Dissemination

   The Board delegates the responsibility for preparation of agendas, recording of minutes, timely dissemination of minutes and materials, and the keeping of records to the Center director.

4. Voting Procedure

   a. Policy decisions are made by consensus. For this Board, consensus is defined as approval without objection.

   b. In the absence of a member, his/her designee may cast the vote.

CONTINUED

SOURCE: The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development Manual: Program, Personnel, Policies
Page 5b

5. Policy Manual

The Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development's Policy Manual, which has been approved by the Policy Board, contains the comprehensive guidelines for general Center operations.

Adopted October 24, 1979

APPENDIX C

Coding Manual for Planning, Participation, and Outcome Variables

ACTIVITY SHEETS

A. Unique code number for each consultant. Activity information is recorded on the consultant's card. Both old activity number and new one (quarter-sequence) are recorded next to the activity topic.

B. Special audience code (Majority of those on sign-in sheet)

1 = administrators
2 = paraprofessionals
3 = pupil personnel services--non-teaching
4 = special education--teaching
5 = parents/students
6 = non-DPS
7 = DFT (as DFT members) (RRC: non-DPS)
8 = staff from one school
9 = open (mixed)

C. Number of participant questionnaires

D. Elementary participation code

1 = not included
2 = activity planned predominantly for one school
3 = activity planned for several/any schools

E. Middle school participation code

1 = not included
2 = activity planned predominantly for one school
3 = activity planned for several/any schools

ACTIVITY SHEETS - continued

F. High School participant code

1 = not included
2 = activity planned predominantly for one school
3 = activity planned for several/any school

G. Participants included regional/central personnel

1 = no
2 = yes

H. Participants included non-DPS staff members

1 = no
2 = yes

I. Region and school code, where applicable

9-000 = many regions/schools
0-000 = non-DPS

ACCUMULATIVE DATA SHEETS

ACTIVITY TITLE: (for later coding of needs and/or topics)

1. Old Identification Number (Component; Year; Month; Sequence)

2. New Identification Number (Quarter; Sequence)

   Sequence is determined by date of first session. Only deviations from "first session" rule occur when activity spans more than one quarter. Line number is circled when more than one quarter is involved.

3. Dates (Month and date of first session; month and date of last session)

4. Days (number of days included in time span of dates)

5. Number of consultants; Code for affiliation

   1 = WSU
   2 = Center
   3 = DPS
   4 = Other public school system
   5 = IHE other than WSU
   6 = Private
   7 = ISD/SDE
   8 = More than one affiliation included
   9 = Unknown

ACCUMULATIVE DATA SHEETS - continued

7. Number of sessions

8. Hours per session; modal hours per session, if necessary

9. Total hours for the activity

10. Number of participants

11. Cumulative attendance

12. Total participant hours

13. Time code (starting time of last seesion is coded)

1 = early morning (7:46-9:45)
2 = late morning (9:46-11:45)
3 = noonday (11:46-12:45)
4 = early afternoon (12:46-2:45)
5 = late afternoon (2:46-4:45)
6 = early evening (4:46-6:45)
7 = late evening (6:46-midnight)
8 = very early (12:01-7:45 a.m.)
9 = unknown

GOVERNANCE BOARD STUDY

QUESTIONNAIRES - RATINGS TO BE STANDARDIZED

	ORIGINAL	REVISION	FINAL
a. overall	facility	facility	a
b. presentation	b	b	b
c. knowledge	c	c	c
d. materials	d	d	d
e. information	f	e	e
f. skills	g	g	f
g. using	h	h	g
h. sharing	-	-	h

1. methods	2.	
2. materials	1.	
3. content		3. aid individuals
4. motivate	5.	
5. instruct		4. classroom management
6. plan	6.	
7. environment	7.	
		8. communication